



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,089	12/06/2001	Gary Cole	WAVE1110-1	8837

EXAMINER	
YIGDALL, MICHAEL J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/11/2007	PAPER

7590 05/11/2007
ROBERT C. KOWERT
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,089

Applicant(s)

COLE, GARY

Examiner

Michael J. Yigdoll

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the decision from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed on January 26, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

The Board construed the term “identity index” to encompass a list of identities presented for quick lookup, where such identities are object identifiers that allow quick access to corresponding information objects (decision, page 9). Accordingly, the Board decided that the claimed “identity index” does not read on the “database” of Gwertzman (decision, page 10), and directed the examiner’s attention to the Hoover (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575) reference (decision, page 12), which is now made of record. New ground(s) of rejection are set forth below.

The Technology Center Director has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Specification

2. The use of the trademarks “WINDOWS NT” and “UNIX” (e.g., paragraph [0003], page 2), “EXCHANGE” (e.g., paragraph [0005], page 3) and “ORACLE” (e.g., paragraph [0032], page 10) is noted in this application.

All trademarks, such as those noted here, should be capitalized wherever they appear and should be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner that might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 6, 14 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 6 (original), the claim attempts to further limit “said set of connection information,” for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 1 recites “connection information,” but does not recite a “set” of such information.

With respect to claim 14 (original), the claim attempts to further limit “said set of connection information,” for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 1 recites “connection information,” but does not recite a “set” of such information.

With respect to claim 27 (original), the claim recites “said set of information object identifiers,” for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 26 recites a “plurality” of information object identifiers rather than a “set” of information object identifiers.

With respect to claim 28 (original), the claim is dependent on claim 27 and is therefore indefinite for the same reason(s).

With respect to claim 29 (original), the claim attempts to further limit “the step of associating at least one of a set of resource definitions with each information object identifier,”

for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 26 instead recites a step of “associating a resource definition with each information object identifier.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 to Hoover et al. (now made of record, “Hoover”).

With respect to claim 1 (previously presented), Hoover teaches a system for managing information (see, for example, the abstract) comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a virtual identity (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which shows a plurality of virtual identities) further comprising:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers each corresponding to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) for each information object, a resource name identifying a resource at which said respective information object is located, wherein said resource name is associated with said respective information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name "RDB1" associated with information object identifier "0011" that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a resource definition corresponding to each respective said named resource, wherein the resource definition further comprises connection information (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 2 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 3 (original), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 4 (original), the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is stored in RAM (see, for

example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 6 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said set of connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 7 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said virtual identity corresponds to a user (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-37, which shows a virtual identity that corresponds to a user, and FIG. 6, which further shows that virtual identities correspond to user computers).

With respect to claim 8 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 9 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said information object identifier comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 10 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 11 (original), the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 12 (original), the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that a virtual attribute value for said virtual attribute is maintained in RAM (see, for example, column 27, lines 14-18, which shows that the values of the virtual attributes in the object attribute table are stored in memory).

With respect to claim 14 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said set of connection information contains a connection parameter selected from one of a hostname, a port, a resource username, a resource password or a resource type (see, for example, column 25, lines 12-16, which shows that the connection information includes parameters such as a hostname and port).

With respect to claim 15 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said resource is one of a Unix system, a Windows NT system, an Oracle

database system or an email server (see, for example, column 12, lines 61-63, which shows that the resource is a Unix system).

With respect to claim 16 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said software program is operable to connect to said resource based on said resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 16-19, which shows that the software program connects to the resource based on the connection information).

With respect to claim 17 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map); and

wherein, said software program is operable to create a composite view of said virtual identity based on said schema map (see, for example, column 25, lines 20-35, which shows creating a composite view of the virtual identity).

With respect to claim 18 (original), the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said software program is operable to present a representation of said composite view in a graphical user interface (see, for example, FIG. 24, which shows a representation of the composite view in a graphical user interface).

With respect to claim 19 (original), the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said graphical user interface is customizable (see, for example, column 52, lines 13-32, which shows that the graphical user interface is customizable).

With respect to claim 20 (previously presented), Hoover teaches a system for managing information (see, for example, the abstract) comprising:

a software program stored on a computer-readable medium operable to maintain an identity index (see, for example, object location service 135 and map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 34-37, which shows that object location service 135 is operable to maintain map table 120, and see, for example, column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index), wherein said identity index comprises:

(a) a plurality of virtual identities (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 7, which shows a plurality of virtual identities), wherein each virtual identity corresponds to a user (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-37, which shows a virtual identity that corresponds to a user, and FIG. 6, which further shows that virtual identities correspond to user computers), and wherein each virtual identity further comprises:

(i) a plurality of information object identifiers, wherein each information object identifier corresponds to a respective information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object); and

(ii) a plurality of resource names, wherein each resource name is associated with an information object identifier and each resource name corresponds to a resource at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name “RDB1” associated with information object identifier “0011” that identifies a resource at which the information object is located); and

(b) a plurality of resource definitions comprising a resource definition for each named resource, wherein each resource definition comprises connection information for the corresponding named resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition corresponding to the resource that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 21 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 22 (original), the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 23 (original), the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each information object identifier comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 24 (original), the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 25 (original), the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each said schema map maps a resource attribute from said resource to a virtual attribute defined by said schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 26 (previously presented), Hoover teaches a method of managing information (see, for example, the abstract) comprising:

storing an identity index comprising a plurality of information object identifiers corresponding to a set of information objects that define a user (see, for example, map table 120 in FIG. 6, and column 23, lines 8-11, which shows that map table 120 is an identity index, and see, for example, column 24, lines 40-50, which shows a plurality of information object identifiers that each correspond to an information object, and column 27, lines 34-37, which shows an information object that defines a user);

associating a resource definition with each information object identifier, wherein each resource definition corresponds to a different one of a plurality of resources at which the information object corresponding to the associated information object identifier is located, and wherein each resource definition contains connection information for the corresponding resource (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource definition associated with information object identifier "0011" and corresponding to a resource at which the information object is located that includes an object attribute table "OAT1," and column 25, lines 7-19, which further shows that the resource definition includes address or connection information).

With respect to claim 27 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each information object identifier from said set of information object identifiers comprises a native key for the corresponding information object (see, for example, column 24, lines 8-16, which shows that the information object identifiers comprise native keys for the corresponding information objects).

With respect to claim 28 (original), the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said native key comprises an account name (see, for example, FIG. 9, which shows an information object identifier "0012" that comprises an account name such as "John Doe").

With respect to claim 29 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that the step of associating at least one of a set of resource definitions with each information object identifier further comprises associating at least one resource name with each information object identifier (see, for example, column 24, lines 52-60, which shows a resource name "RDB1" associated with information object identifier "0011").

With respect to claim 30 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each information object comprises a user account (see, for example, column 27, lines 34-49, which shows an information object that comprises a user account, such as a person's account with an insurance company, health maintenance organization, etc.).

With respect to claim 31 (original), the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that each resource definition further comprises a schema map (see, for example, column 27, lines 11-14, which shows that the object attribute table is a schema map).

With respect to claim 32 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches that said schema map maps a resource attribute to a virtual attribute (see, for example, column 27, lines 28-34, which shows that the object attribute table maps resource attributes to virtual attributes defined in the form of column headings).

With respect to claim 33 (original), the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated, and Hoover further teaches creating a composite view of a user based on said schema map from each resource definition (see, for example, column 25, lines 20-35, which shows creating a composite view of a user).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192

m jy



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


Director, TC 2100